

Remarks

The Applicants note the withdrawal of the previous rejections and note the new rejection of Claims 1, 4-13, and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Schlueter. The Applicants have cancelled Claims 1, 4-13, and 16-24, thereby rendering the rejection moot. However, the Applicants have added new Claims 25-41. Those claims generally correspond to Claims 1, 4-13 and 16-21 respectively. Entry into the official file and consideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

New Claim 25 recites an antistatic film comprising a polyimide film with no conductive ultrafine particles and having a thickness of 7.5-125 μm . Support for the polyimide film not having conductive ultrafine particles may be found in the Applicants' Specification at page 8, line 19, for example. The antistatic film also comprises a metal oxide and conductive ultrafine particle mixed layer formed on a surface of the polyimide film comprising a metal of the metal oxide and conductive ultrafine particles in a weight ratio (metal/conductive ultrafine particles) of 0.01-0.1, and having a thickness of 0.05-0.15 μm and a surface resistivity of no greater than $10^8 \Omega/\square$. Support for the surface resistivity of the mixed layer may be found in the Applicants' Specification on page 3, for example, at lines 11-13. Support may also be found in original Claim 12.

New independent Claims 34 and 35 also recite that the supporting polyimide film has no conductive ultrafine particles. Claim 34 also recites that the mixed layer has a surface resistance value of no greater than $10^8 \Omega/\square$.

The structure recited in independent Claims 25, 34, and 35 is completely different from the films of Schlueter. In fact, the Applicants respectfully submit that Schlueter teaches away from the subject matter of Claims 25, 34, and 35. Schlueter is replete with such opposite teachings. They may be found beginning in column 4 at line 4 wherein Schlueter teaches a polyimide film containing electrically conductive doped metal oxide fillers dispersed therein. Lines 9-11 teach the same thing, namely a polyimide film containing electrically conductive fillers of antimony doped tin oxide dispersed therein. Lines 30-32 again teach a polyimide film that comprises electrically conductive doped metal oxide fillers. That is in the Summary of the Invention portion of Schlueter. Then moving on to the Detailed Description, still in column 4, Schlueter teaches a substrate which comprises a polyimide having electrically conductive doped metal oxide fillers dispersed or contained therein. This is set forth in lines 63-67. The top of column 5 continues these teachings at lines 2-4.

The remainder of the Detailed Description portion of Schlueter further describes such polyimide films containing electrically conductive fillers. These are illustrated in Figs. 3-5 in a one-layer, two-layer and three-layer, respectively, diagrammatic form wherein polyimide layer 30 contains electrically conductive filler 31.

The teachings of Schlueter extend through the three examples and even into main Claim 1 which recites a polyimide film and at least one electrically conductive metal oxide filler dispersed therein.

The Applicants traveled in the opposite direction and disregarded the teachings of Schlueter and provide a polyimide support film which has no conductive ultrafine particles. Instead, the claimed support film is free of conductive ultrafine particles. The Applicants respectfully submit that they did exactly the opposite of what the prior art teaches. The Applicants respectfully submit that doing the opposite of what the prior art teaches is excellent evidence of patentability. The Applicants therefore respectfully submit that Schlueter is inapplicable to newly submitted Claims 25-41.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicants

TDC:as
(215) 656-3381